

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

<b>Antonio Caraballo,</b>	)	<b>CASE NO. 1: 16 CV 3024</b>
	)	
<b>Petitioner,</b>	)	<b>JUDGE PATRICIA A. GAUGHAN</b>
	)	
<b>Vs.</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Charmaine Bracy,</b>	)	<b><u>Memorandum of Opinion and Order</u></b>
	)	
<b>Respondent.</b>	)	

**INTRODUCTION**

This matter is before the Court upon the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge James R. Knepp, II (Doc. 9), filed on June 12, 2018, which recommends dismissal of the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pending before the Court. As of this date, Petitioner has not filed any objections.<sup>1</sup> For the reasons that follow, the Report and Recommendation is ACCEPTED.

---

<sup>1</sup> Petitioner filed a document entitled “Response to Your Decision” on July 12, 2018, in which he notes that he has “no way to respond to” the Report and Recommendation because of “the quality of ‘jailhouse lawyers’” in his prison. In this document, Petitioner did not identify any portions of the Report and Recommendation to which he was objecting.

## **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

When objections are made to a Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court reviews the case *de novo*. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b) provides in pertinent part:

The district judge to whom the case is assigned shall make a *de novo* determination upon the record, or after additional evidence, of any portion of the magistrate judge's disposition to which specific written objection has been made in accordance with this rule. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended decision, receive further evidence, or recommit the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.

As stated in the Advisory Committee Notes, "When no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." In *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985), the Court held, "It does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate judge's factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings."

## **DECISION**

This Court, having reviewed the Report and Recommendation and finding no clear error, accepts the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. In accordance with that recommendation, the Court hereby denies the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus for the reasons stated by the Magistrate Judge in the Report and Recommendation, which is incorporated herein by reference. Furthermore, the Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith, and that there is no basis upon which to issue a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); Fed.R.App.P. 22(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Patricia A. Gaughan  
PATRICIA A. GAUGHAN  
United States District Court  
Chief Judge

Dated: 7/30/18